

**Illinois Commerce Commission**  
**SBC/Ameritech Illinois Merger, Docket 98-0555**  
**Performance Benchmarks Collaborative, Condition 30**  
**Final Meeting Minutes From 6/6-7/2000**  
**Modified and Approved 7/12/2000**

The sixth Illinois Performance Measure Collaborative was held on June 6 and 7, 2000 at the State of Illinois Center building in Chicago, Illinois. Following are minutes and action items from that meeting.

Mr. McClerren, ICC Staff, presided over the meeting

June 6, 2000

- I.       Introductions
  - A.     Staff, Ameritech Illinois, CLECs, Other Parties
  - B.     Sign up sheet, with contact name, address, phone & e-mail address
- II.      Administrative Matters
  - A.     Meeting Procedures
  - B.     Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) participation recommended
  - C.     Discussions "off the record" until final positions are developed
  - D.     Final positions, decisions, agreements, disagreements, documents to be documented
  - E.     Business casual attire
- III.     ICC Web Site
  - A.     Draft Issues Matrix
  - B.     Draft Illinois Rules
  - C.     Schedule
- IV.      Review and approve meeting minutes from May 4-5.
  - A.     The review of the minutes produced four modifications to the draft minutes. Mr. McClerren agreed to implement the changes as proposed.
  - B.     Discussion Items (as a result of reviewing the minutes)
    - 1.     Measure 107 – Ameritech to review the documentation for intervals for collocation augments, answer MCI questions with respect to limits on DS1/DS3 cabling and DSLAM for proposed 30-day interval for augments.
    - 2.     Discussed the differences between Ameritech method to post results to the web vs. Texas method. Ameritech indicated that SBC/Ameritech was working internally to implement modifications proposed by CLECs as well as to make the separate web sites look and feel similar. Ameritech requested that CLECs provide any input to Mr. Barton prior to Thursday June 8.
    - 3.     Ameritech agreed to review the Accessible Letters to see if the revised facility modification policy has been shared with CLECs.
    - 4.     AT&T discussed a SWBT Accessible Letter on a conference to be held regarding Raw Data. Ameritech to investigate.
- V.       Status of SBC/Ameritech Waiver Request (FOC Issue).
  - 1.     Discussion on the issue of FOC measurement parity vs. benchmark dispute and related flow-through ordering. Ameritech committed to provide a response by mid June as to what it would agree to measure with regard to total flow-through. AT&T

recommended that a briefing schedule be set for the next phase of the process. *(Additional related discussion from 6/7/00)* – CLECs suggested that the current flow-through measurement is not adequate since it is based on that which is “designed to flow-through”. Since Ameritech decides what will be designed to flow-through, there is no incentive for Ameritech to increase the total base of flow-through (and therefore performance). Ameritech responded that there are already economic incentives to design as much to flow-through as possible in the form of expense savings (resources deployed at the LSC) and performance measure remedies.

CLECs recommended a “Bell Atlantic like” approach to improving flow-through. Mr. McNally from McLeod proposed a schedule whereby Ameritech would pay a penalty based on overall flow-through results if Ameritech did not reach certain objectives within specified periods of time. Mr. Fioretti agreed to investigate what could be done along the lines of the McLeod proposal. An example of the proposal follows:

	<b>Designed to Flow-through</b>	<b>Overall Flow-through</b>	<b>Proposed Penalty</b>
<b>Today</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>30%</b>	10-20% \$X 20-25% \$(X-Y) 25-30% \$(X-(Y+Z)) ≥30 \$ 0
<b>6 month</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<30% \$X 30-35% \$(X-Y) 35-40% \$(X-(Y+Z)) ≥40 \$ 0

- VI. Gaining access to performance measures.
  - A. Mr. McClerren reviewed CLEC positions with regard to signing of the proposed interconnection agreement amendment. Although most agreed that they would be signing the amendment, none suggested that they would sign it as it is currently written.
  - B. As to the tariff, Staff (and Staff attorney) do not agree that the tariff should be filed as written.
    - 1. The tariff does not address Resale customers (Specific to UNEs as it is written into the UNE tariff.
    - 2. The Sole Remedy provision would not have Commission Staff support.
    - 3. Having the tariff reference the business rules “as posted on the SBC web site” was thought to be an issue.
  - C. Action item was to have Ameritech attorney (Sunderland) and Staff attorney (Aridas) discuss and then bring to all parties.
- VII. “North Carolina” style report.
  - A. Ameritech reported that it had made no progress on the North Carolina style report, but had combined both the Ohio and Illinois PM enhancement matrices into one.
- VIII. Hot-Cut process.
  - A. Mr. Ron Cate and Ms. Donna Navickus from Ameritech reviewed the work in progress from the Wisconsin based discussions documenting the Hot Cut process. There was some discussion over methods to eliminate the faxed “cut schedule” from the Ameritech process by utilizing a combination of the FDT and CHC fields. Ameritech agreed to investigate whether there might be any possibilities to incorporate this method and report back to collaborative participants.

1. A matrix identifying the valid requests for each type of order was reviewed.
- B. Measurements reviewed:
  1. Current Texas measures 114-115 and how they fit into the process were reviewed.
  2. "Provisioning Trouble Report" process was discussed and Ameritech committed to investigate further how it could be incorporated into its current method of taking provisioning reports at the provisioning center within 24 hours of the due date.
  3. CLECs proposed another measure regarding "MTTR" on pre-mature disconnects. Ameritech to consider.
  4. CLECs proposed adding a disaggregation of Stand-alone Loops to measure 114. Ameritech to consider.
  5. Discussion relating to new disaggregation on measurement 114.1 regarding numbers of loops. CLECs wanting more disaggregation, Ameritech suggested that <10 Lines, and 10-24 Lines were sufficient as CLECs would otherwise order a T1 rather than individual Loops. Ameritech to consider implementing a version of Texas 114.1.
  6. Measurement 115 was not debated.

June 7, 2000

- IX. Business Rules for Performance Measures 79 - 106.
  - A. Performance Measures 107-122 were discussed and documented on the attached PM matrix. Key comments/issues are listed below:
    1. Discussion on measurement #79, Illinois administrative code part 730 requires 7 second response time. It was agreed that the benchmark should be set at 7 seconds. Mr. McClerren noted that the code is in the process of being modified (anticipated in approximately 6 months) to reflect a 10 second answer time.
    2. Sprint requested that when OS/DA branding is introduced that participants re-visit the issues of parity vs. benchmark and specific data by CLEC based on the possibility that Operator can then potentially discriminate in answering calls. Ameritech agreed to re-visit the issue at the appropriate time.
    3. CLECs proposed eliminating measurements #84, 85, and 86.
    4. Ameritech to investigate why PM #96 includes only non-mechanized rejects.
    5. CLECs questioned whether 911 measures #102, 103, and 104 were state specific (YES).
- X. Set interim July dates, as well as August meeting dates.
  - A. July dates set as July 11 and 12, 2000
  - B. August dates set as August 16 and 17, 2000